



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,357	09/16/2003	Shunpei Yamazaki	12732-167001	9624
26171	7590	01/18/2005	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 1425 K STREET, N.W. 11TH FLOOR WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500			MICHENER, JENNIFER KOLB	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1762	

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/662,357	Applicant(s) YAMAZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner Jennifer K. Michener	Art Unit 1762	

All Participants:
Status of Application: _____

 (1) Jennifer K. Michener.

(3) _____.

 (2) John Hayden.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 January 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/STP Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner phoned Applicant's representative to inquire into the status of the case on January 6, 2005 because a reply to the restriction requirement had not been received. Mr. Hayden informed Examiner that the restriction requirement was sent to him in error because the numbers of the application number were transposed. The restriction was directed to another, unrelated case. Mr. Hayden reminded Examiner that they had spoken in June of 2004 and he had agreed to destroy that action so that Examiner could issue the written restriction requirement in the correct case. Examiner indicated to Mr. Hayden that she would work to return his case to the proper Examiner (Karabi Guharay) and to remove the non-final action code from his case in our PALM system ..